

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Application Status

Claims 8-14 were indicated allowable if rewritten in an independent format. Claims 8, 13, and 14 have been rewritten in an independent format. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8-10 and 13-14 are now allowable.

The status of claims 25-27 is uncertain. Applicants presume that these claims stand allowed.

Claims 1-7 and 15-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Stanners (US 6,583,864).

The 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. For brevity the Applicants have not necessarily presented all of the reasons as to why Stanners does not anticipate the claims. Nevertheless, Applicants' remarks are sufficient to show that Stanners does not teach every feature, relationship, and step arranged in the manner recited in the claims, as is required to sustain the rejections. Applicants reserve the right to later present even more reasons negating the allegations of anticipation.

Claim 1

Stanners does not anticipate the recited method of claim 1. Where does Stanners teach operating a transaction function device *in conducting a transaction* such that the *condition* of the transaction function device changes? The Action is silent as to what element in Stanners constitutes the recited first transaction function device. Further, what transaction function device condition changes? Stanners is directed to an iris identification system. The system is for determining whether a person is authorized to use an ATM. After a person is verified, *then* that person can use the ATM to perform a transaction (col. 4, lines 14-18).

Furthermore, where does Stanners teach, *responsive to the change* in the transaction function device condition, changing a color output adjacent to where a *user interacts* with the transaction function device? Where does Stanners change a color output in response to a changed condition in a transaction function device? With what transaction function device in Stanners does a user interact in the identification process? Again, the Action is silent as to what element in Stanners constitutes the recited first transaction function device. Further, where in Stanners is a multicolor light emitting device adjacent to this transaction function device?

Stanners does not teach every feature, relationship, and step arranged in the manner recited in claim 1, as is required to sustain the rejection. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Stanners does not anticipate the recited method of claim 21. Where does Stanners teach changing a color that is output at a user interface of an automated banking machine, especially *during* machine operation in performing a transaction? As previously discussed, Stanners' iris identification system is for determining whether a person is authorized to use an ATM. First a person is determined to be authorized, *then* that (authorized) person can use the ATM to perform a transaction (col. 4, lines 14-18). That is, Stanners' identification determining is conventionally carried out before the ATM can be operated to perform a transaction. Why would Stanners perform authorization during a transaction?

Stanners does not teach every feature, relationship, and step arranged in the manner recited in claim 21, as is required to sustain the rejection. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

The Dependent Claims

Each of the dependent claims depends directly or indirectly from an independent claim. Thus, it is asserted that the dependent claims are allowable on at least the same basis. Furthermore, each of the dependent claims additionally recites specific features and relationships that patentably distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art. The reference does not teach or suggest the features and relationships that are specifically recited in the dependent claims. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are further allowable due to the recitation of such additional features and relationships.

Fee For Extra Independent Claims

Please charge the fee associated with the submission of two additional independent claims (\$400) and any other fee due to Deposit Account 09-0428.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance.

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Office's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke Reg. No. 31,029
WALKER & JOCKE
231 South Broadway
Medina, Ohio 44256
(330) 721-0000